

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----x  
SNEZANA STANKOVIC, *pro se*, :  
: Plaintiff, : **SUMMARY ORDER**  
-against- : 12-cv-04148 (DLI)  
: COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, :  
: Defendant. :  
: :  
-----x

**DORA L. IRIZARRY, U.S. District Judge:**

*Pro se*<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff Snezana Stankovic (“Plaintiff”) filed this action seeking review of a decision by the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration denying Plaintiff’s application for Social Security Disability and/or Supplemental Security Income under the Social Security Act. Plaintiff also seeks to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). The court grants Plaintiff’s request to proceed IFP solely for the purpose of this Summary Order. For the reasons set forth below, the complaint is dismissed.

Plaintiff claims that since 1997 she has been disabled because of “L5 Degenerative Disk (Back Injury) and Infectious Disease.” (See Compl. ¶ 4.) Plaintiff seeks review of an Administrative Law Judge’s denial of her claim on April 14, 2010, and claims that the Appeals Council denied her request for review on March 27, 2012. (See *id.* ¶¶ 7-8.) This is the same claim that Plaintiff previously brought in *Stankovic v. Commissioner of Social Security*, Docket No. 12-cv-2242 (E.D.N.Y filed on May 3, 2012), which currently is pending before this court.

---

<sup>1</sup> In reviewing Plaintiff’s complaint, the court is mindful that, “a *pro se* complaint, however inartfully pleaded, must be held to less stringent standards than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers.” *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007). The court construes *pro se* pleadings “to raise the strongest arguments that they suggest.” *Triestman v. Fed. Bureau of Prisons*, 470 F. 3d 471, 474 (2d Cir. 2006) (emphasis omitted).

“As part of its general power to administer its docket, a district court may stay or dismiss a suit that is duplicative of another federal court suit.” *Curtis v. Citibank, N.A.*, 226 F. 3d 133, 138 (2d Cir. 2000). The Second Circuit has held that “plaintiffs have no right to maintain two actions on the same subject in the same court, against the same defendant at the same time.” *Id.* at 139. For this reason, the complaint in this action is dismissed.

Indeed, in an August 20, 2012 Memorandum and Order (“August 20 Order”), this court, *inter alia*, dismissed two actions, *Stankovic v. Social Security Field Office Supervisor*, Docket No. 12-cv-3225 (E.D.N.Y. filed on June 25, 2012) and *Stankovic v. Social Security Office of Disability Adjudication*, Docket No. 12-cv-3226 (E.D.N.Y. filed on June 25, 2012), arising out of the denial of Plaintiff’s disability benefits as duplicative and meritless. *See Stankovic v. Smith*, 2012 WL 3597760 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2012). Plaintiff is admonished to cease filing new actions relating to the Commissioner’s decision to deny her benefits.

Moreover, since February 2012, Plaintiff has filed 18 actions in this court, as well as two additional actions before another judge of this district. In the August 20 Order, this court *sua sponte* dismissed fourteen of the actions with prejudice and two without prejudice to file amended complaints. The two actions before a different judge in this district were also dismissed *sua sponte* as meritless. *See Stankovic v. Frankel*, 2012 WL 2700648, at \*2-3 (E.D.N.Y. July 6, 2012). Plaintiff is reminded, as the court explained in its August 20 Order, that, if she continues to file frivolous complaints, the court will bar her from filing future IFP actions without leave of the court.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the complaint is dismissed with prejudice. The court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this Order would not be taken in good faith and, therefore, IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444–45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York  
August 28, 2012

---

/s/  
DORA L. IRIZARRY  
United States District Judge